



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/635,708

08/05/2003

Juan R. Loaiza

OI7011443001

1877

23639 7590 09/24/2008

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER

LY, CHEYNE D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2168

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/635,708	Applicant(s) LOAIZA ET AL.	
	Examiner CHEYNE D. LY	Art Unit 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 13, 2008 has been entered.
2. Claims 15-45 are examined on the merits.
3. The rejections of record have been withdrawn; therefore, arguments directed to withdrawn rejections are moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 15-24, 26-34, and 36-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downing et al. (US 6,289,335B1) (Downing hereafter) taken with Lindsay et al. (1986) (Lindsay hereafter).

MOTIVATION TO COMBINE

7. Downing describes there is a need for a database system that can perform a fast refresh of snapshots defined by queries (column 3, lines 42-48). Lindsay describes a method for providing efficient support for remote snapshots by allowing each snapshot to extract only needed data from the base table (page 54, column 1, lines 1-16). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by Lindsay to address the need described by Downing by providing efficient support for remote snapshots by allowing each snapshot to extract only needed data from the base table.

BASIS FOR PRIOR ART

8. In regard to claim 15, Downing discloses a method of accessing database recovery logs, said method comprising:

selecting one or more of said database recovery logs to access (column 7, line 13, e.g. “order line log”);

establishing a view of said one or more database recovery logs (Figures 5(a)-(c));

insulating said view from a format of said one or more database recovery logs

(Figures 5(a)-(c));

issuing a database statement to query said view (column 12, lines 15-38, e.g. QUERY

4a); and

retrieving data from said one or more database recovery logs in response to said database statement (column 12, lines 15-38, e.g. QUERY 4a).

9. Downing describes a snapshot can be refreshed on a periodic basis to reflect the current state of its corresponding base tables (column 1, lines 15-17). However, Downing does not explicitly describe that "the at least one of the database recovery logs contains information for restoring that database to a specific state.

10. Lindsay describes "the at least one of the database recovery logs contains information for restoring that database to a specific state" (page 54, column 1, last paragraph, e.g. the recovery log is used to buffer the information need for snapshot refresh, column 2, e.g. the recovery log can support snapshot refresh "as of" a given time).

11. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of Downing with the use of recovery logs to support the snapshot refresh as described by Lindsay.

12. In regard to claim 16, Downing discloses insulating said view comprises:

Generating a data dictionary snapshot (column 5, line 42, e.g. a snapshot definition query has been interpreted as data dictionary); and

Translating said data using said data dictionary snapshot (column 2, lines 1-9, e.g.

Since a snapshot also stores administrative information, the database system presents to Smith a snapshot view, which hides the administrative information).

13. In regard to claim 17, Downing discloses data is translated into an external data format (column 2, lines 1-9, e.g. a snapshot view, which hides the administrative information which represents an external format).

Art Unit: 2168

14. In regard to claim 18, Downing discloses time and/or date boundaries are established for said recovery logs (column 12, lines 15-38, e.g. QUERY 4a, especially, "TIME\$\$")

15. In regard to claim 19, Downing discloses wherein said database statement is a SQL statement (column 12, lines 15-38, e.g. QUERY 4a).

16. In regard to claim 20, Downing discloses said recovery logs comprise an a redo log (column 3, lines 55-60, e.g. "refresh").

17. In regard to claims 21 and 23, Downing discloses said view is a relational view comprising at least one row and at least one column (Figures 5(a)-(c)). The inclusion of Alexander et al. is not being used as prior art, but only to support that it is well know in the art that a "view is a relational table that does not exist in physical storage but is derived from one or more base tables (Alexnder et al., column 2, lines 41-44).

18. In regard to claim 22, Downing discloses said view is formed from a plurality of said recovery logs (Figure 9(a) and (b), e.g. "process master logs").

19. In regard to claim 24, Downing discloses constructing a virtual table using data from said one or more database recovery logs (Figures 4(a) to (c), e.g. ORDER_LINE LOG), wherein a format of said virtual table is different than the format of said one or more database recovery logs (Figures 7(a) to (b), e.g. ORDER_LINE SNAPSHOT VIEW).

20. In regard to claims 26-34 and 36-44, Downing discloses the computer program and system (column 4, line 65, to column 5, line 39, and Figure 1) for the above cited method.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2168

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

23. Claims 25, 35, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downing et al. (US 6,289,335B1) (Downing hereafter) taken with Lindsay et al. (1986) (Lindsay hereafter) as cited above.

24. Downing in view of Lindsay describes the claimed invention of claims 25, 35, and 45, However, Downing in view of Lindsay is silent about the limitation of “the format of said virtual table does not change when the format of said recover logs change.” As discussed above, Downing describes the views (virtual table) are specified by the query definitions. Further, as illustrated by the ORDER_LINE LOG (Figure 4(a) item 402, and Figure 7(a) item 402 wherein the formats of the respective virtual table is define by the query definitions which result the format being different from that of the ORDER_LINE LOG. Therefore, it would have been reasonable to interpreted that the format of said virtual table as defined by the query definitions does not change when the format of said recover logs change.

Art Unit: 2168

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that the format of virtual table as defined by the query definitions in Downing in view of Lindsay does not change when the format of said recover logs change.

CONCLUSION

25. The prior art made of record on Form 892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

26. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

27. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The USPTO's official fax number is 571-272-8300.

Art Unit: 2168

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

29. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo, can be reached on (571) 272-3642.

/Cheyne D Ly/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168